4-1-1942

Trinity College Bulletin, 1941-1942 (Four College Papers)

Trinity College

VOLUME XXXIX NEW SERIES NUMBER 2

Trinity College Bulletin

FOUR TRINITY COLLEGE PAPERS

Hartford, Connecticut
April, 1942

Trinity College Bulletin

LEADERSHIP
by E. E. Wilson

•

ET PRÆVALEBIT
by Dr. R. B. Ogilby

•

Report of Executive Committee
of B.A. Degree to the Trustees

•

GETTYSBURG VIA HARTFORD
by P. J. McCook

Hartford, Connecticut

April, 1942

Trinity College Bulletin

Issued Quarterly by the College. Entered January 12, 1904, at Hartford, Conn., as second class matter under the Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 3, 1919.

The Bulletin includes in its issues: the College Catalogue; Reports of the President, Treasurer, and Librarian; Announcements, Necrology and Circulars of Information.

PRINTED IN U.S.

Leadership

BY

E. E. WILSON

An Address at the Open Air Service on the Campus of Trinity College Commencement Day, May 17, 1942

EACH year at this time, new groups of young people turn their backs on school and look hopefully out into the world. The level of their hopefulness varies with circumstances, and is seldom high. At graduation we are prone to believe that all frontiers have been crossed, and that little remains to be discovered, when, in reality, we are but on the threshold of opportunity.

I recall so well my own outlook from the elevated platform of a high school in the far Northwest. There seemed to be no more frontiers such as those my father and mother had pioneered in covered wagons. And yet today I find myself, more through accident than anything else, responsible for an enterprise that none could even conceive the days when we used to say, "I can no more do that than fly!"

Few men carrying grave responsibilities acquire them through their own clear vision and determined efforts. There are few Horatio Alger heroes, few lads who, upon opening their First Readers, determine to become President of the United States, and by dint of courage and determination, attain their boyhood goals. Frequently men who have succeeded and who are still honest with themselves look at men who have not succeeded, and humbly admit, "There, but for the grace of God, go I." Under their breaths they may add, "And I may go there yet!"

By this I do not mean for a moment that one should sit back and trust to luck. To the limit of his personal capacities, and within the limits of his vision, each must try to be the master of his soul. Today's young men have the benefit of a better analysis of their potentialities and greater help in shaping their own

courses than in years gone by. The first step for any young man is an honest estimate of his own character, personality and aptitude. The next step is a review of the general situation and an estimate of the broad considerations that dictate future developments and thus delineate new opportunities.

Men who so order their affairs as to provide time to think are concerned lest the machine they have created may have become a Frankenstein. We in aviation are appalled that what we created in youthful hope that it would benefit mankind is now used as one of the greatest destructive forces of all times.

The development of aviation has brought fundamental changes. From the military point of view, it has made possible direct attack against the civil population. It has laid bare to bombardment our libraries, our museums—every institution which we value most. However, in times of peace it is susceptible of employment in equally revolutionary ways for the benefit of mankind. We in aviation have from its beginning felt the urge to direct its application along constructive, rather than destructive, lines. Now, for the moment, we find our efforts thwarted.

For years many of the keenest minds have been directed into scientific works. This is a fascinating field to men of logic because the work is with materials and forces which can be expected to do the same thing under the same conditions every time. Applied Science is something you can get your teeth into.

Meanwhile, however, in the process of thinking about materials, we have neglected men. People aren't mechanical robots. They are complicated personalities. And the more information they possess, the more complicated they become. Among the great scientific advances, that of improved communications is profoundly revolutionary. It has brought the far corners of the world into intimate personal contact, before most of these corners have found out how to get along in their own neighborhoods. It has exposed us to ideological epidemics of devastating power. Little wonder that we who have not learned to live and let live on the campus are at each other's throats on the high seas.

Thus one of the great unexplored frontiers is that of human relations. While our research people create new miracles, we fumble our elementary internal and public relations. We know

how to put a governor on a generator to keep it from running away, but we don't know how to balance the spiritual forces which are even more dangerous. Unless we learn to improve our Leadership, the machine we have created bids fair to destroy us. The whole world cries for courageous Leadership.

To most of us, Leadership is an abstract term. It isn't a major course in college. It is more or less taken for granted. Little is written about it, but its elements can be developed by studying the lives and examples of great leaders.

Leadership here means the ability to direct. To a great extent, it is born in men—not made. However, like other qualities, it can be cultivated, if present, and made to flower.

It has been said that there are two basic requirements of Leadership—Knowledge and Character—and that as between the two, Character is more important in the ratio of two to one! This ratio varies between two broad types of Leadership.

If you examine the conduct of great commanders, you will find them divided into two categories, the Drivers and the Leaders. The Driver gets results by sheer force, or Coercion. The Leader gets results by persuasion, or Cooperation.

In the case of the Driver, Knowledge plays a more important part. Since he resorts to Coercion, he can hardly expect loyal initiative from his subordinates. He must therefore know more about his job than anyone else, and be on the job all the time.

In the case of the Leader, Character assumes the greater importance. Character inspires loyalty, which, in turn, promotes the initiative of the subordinate. This places the Knowledge of all subordinates at the disposition of the Leader.

A Leader analyzes his own personality and chooses the method which best suits it. He must next select his associates from his own kind. At the risk of over-simplifying in the effort to develop a point, it may be said that the Driver usually resorts to fear as the driving force under the system of Coercion, while the Leader uses hope of reward as his guiding light. This is, of course, a generalization, because each type of Leader will utilize both methods, if not with his subordinates, certainly with his opponents. In other words, he will recognize the uses of each and employ each where it is indicated.

In general, however, we Americans prefer the Cooperative Way. Our forbears, and even some of us, came to the New World to escape the Coercion of the Old. There is no question in our minds as to which method is superior for ourselves. If the Germans want their Junkers or their Hitlers, and the Japanese want their Shoguns, let them have them. We Americans want our Washingtons and our Lincolns.

Unfortunately the peoples who want dictators scorn our way and seek to impose their leadership on us. They endeavor to exploit the advantage of the initiative of the aggressor by a surprise knock-out blow in an effort to seize objectives and consolidate gains before the superiority of team play can overwhelm them.

Loyalty is a strong spiritual quality. One owes his Loyalty primarily to the Cause, and secondarily to the Leader. It is a happy circumstance if one can give full Loyalty to both Leader and Cause. Loyalty works both ways, up and down. The Leader who expects Loyalty from his subordinates must demonstrate Loyalty to them, to the limit that Loyalty to the Cause will permit. The Cause has the first claim on Loyalty.

Strong Loyalty breeds intelligent initiative. This is the strength of the Cooperative System which, by giving free play to natural forces, produces miracles of planning that no mastermind could ever conceive.

With the intelligence and initiative of the subordinates directed in all Loyalty to the Cause, it is possible for even a weak force, through the sheer power of its spirituality, to prevail over forces that are stronger physically. The history of athletics is replete with illustrations of this principle. I recall vividly how the very year Mussolini marched on Rome, an American Rifle Team, of which I was an officer, shot it out in Milan, Italy, with a Swiss team of professional armorers who were individually superior marksmen, but who fell before American team work.

As I have said, the guiding light of the Cooperative system is hope of reward. In the business world, this reward must be measured by profit, for profit is the index of worth—the governor of costs. A stronger social sense is a basic requirement of sound

business. But in every endeavor the real reward is the Knowledge of Work Well Done, whether the outer symbols be a large house on the hill or a little medal in its case or a piece of sheepskin on the wall.

Good Leadership recognizes and rewards individual and group merit. Ability to accord credit to the subordinates is often a test of the character of the Leader.

These, then, are the fundamentals of the American Type of Leadership. It calls for Character of the highest type, i. e., moral courage, integrity, devotion and spiritual force. It depends upon the Loyalty and Initiative of the subordinate and is sparked by the Hope of Reward. It calls for sacrifice for the common good, and provides high inspiration.

Let us then examine the practical application of some of these theoretical factors. One of the fundamental requirements of Leadership is the ability to delegate authority. It is axiomatic that authority and responsibility must go hand in hand. It is an elementary principle that a Leader who asks a subordinate to accept responsibility to him, must delegate the authority necessary to meet the responsibility. A Leader can delegate authority, but not responsibility. No matter what happens, the responsibility remains his. This fact induces a certain reluctance on the part of Leaders to delegate authority. The ability to do this is another test of the Character of the Leader.

In general, a Leader, since he has all the responsibility, expects to have things done his way. At the same time, he recognizes that every man functions best when he does things his own way. The Leader, then, confines his control of the way in which things are done to the generalities, leaving the subordinate freedom to function in his own personality within this scope.

In the assignment of responsibilities and the delegation of authority, the Leader endeavors to conform to natural subdivisions, in order that lines of demarcation may be clear to all. He may set up a chart of his organization, but a good organization is usually so simple that no chart is required. Conversely, if a chart is required, he finds it worth while to review the organization to see if it can't be simplified.

Each organization is administered through a routine, or system. System, designed originally to simplify, frequently com-

plicates in the end. A Leader takes care that he does not become a slave to his system. This is hard to avoid in this country, where paper work enmeshes every organization and the typewriter may become a millstone around every neck.

The Leader may wish to convey his ideas through written orders, but he is careful to confine these to general principles so as to permit freedom of individual initiative and action. The more freedom a subordinate has, the more initiative he shows. Outside the limits of written instructions, a Leader's desires may be transmitted through indoctrination.

A well indoctrinated subordinate faced with a tactical situation for which no detailed orders can have been issued asks himself what the senior would want done, and proceeds to do it. For him to know what the senior wants done, he must have been thoroughly indoctrinated in the plan and be loyal to it. This indoctrination may be through orders or conference, or may flow from long familiarity with the character and objectives of the Leader. In any event, the Leader develops a policy and a plan and conveys them to his associates. These must be sound in conception and contain spiritual elements for which men are glad to make sacrifices. A Leader inspires his followers to do better than they know how.

He is careful to collect all relevant information and to disseminate it to his subordinates. He bases his plans and decisions, as far as possible, upon the recommendations of his subordinates. The more the plan is their own, the greater the enthusiasm with which they will execute it. Any fair decision promptly taken and loyally supported is superior to the best plan taken too late or prosecuted with irresolution.

A Leader seeks his subordinate's advice, but reserves the right to reject it—and having done so, will expect even more cheerful execution by the subordinate than if the advice had been taken.

A Leader stands or falls upon the choice of his subordinates. A good Leader chooses them for their qualities of Leadership. He rewards the successful and removes the incompetent. Today we are prone to judge men by their technical or mechanical ability, when Leadership is really the prerequisite. Great tech-

nical ability and good Leadership are rarely combined in one person.

A Leader maintains discipline. Discipline does not imply bluster. The energy spent in making noise is energy wasted. The more powerful the machine, the more quietly it must run.

These are some of the practical applications of Leadership.

One of the rare but important qualities of a Leader is statesmanship. Statesmanship here means the capacity for viewing matters in the light of their general, rather than personal, significance. Thus Washington, Lincoln and Lee stand as examples of statesmen who, without rancor or vindictiveness, acted with great tolerance for the common good. This quality is another outstanding requirement of character in a great Leader.

The type of Knowledge required for competent Leadership is not necessarily that acquired in college. It is rather a clear understanding of fundamentals and the ability to reason to logical conclusions. Today, our facility of communication by radio subjects us to such an avalanche of trivia, superficialities and even misinformation that fundamental truths are obscured. It is perhaps more difficult now than at any previous time to think clearly and fundamentally. We suffer from cold hearts and wandering minds.

How, now, can you men contribute to the progress of the world? Our scientific advance threatens to outstrip our spiritual progress. We are reminded here of the story of the native bearers on an African safari, who, having been forced to trek several days at high speed, refused to proceed from the last halt for a day or two, until their souls had had time to catch up with their bodies! Our souls must catch up with our intellects.

There are those who feel technology must mark time to permit this. Others hope that out of the sacrifices of war will come new spiritual concepts to replace the materialism of the present.

Our forefathers founded our Freedom upon strong convictions as to morality and religion and a firm faith in God. The Defense of American Freedom calls for a moral and spiritual renaissance. This demands Leadership of the highest type in public affairs.

Those of you about to enter the military establishments will there experience the high privilege of Service, Sacrifice and Leadership. My generation has cultivated the green pastures of Science and Industry. Yours must explore the range beyond that horizon. Here is a frontier whose barriers conceal untold opportunities for Public Service of the highest order. Here is the Challenge to your generation!

Et Prævalebit

BY

DR. R. B. OGILBY
President of Trinity College

AN American travelling in the Orient soon learns either by precept or by bitter experience the technique of asking his way when he gets lost. If, for example, he finds himself wandering in the hills of Northern Luzon in the Philippine Islands and meets an Igorot warrior, he does not ask, "Is this the trail to Bontok?" Similarly, if he is trying to find his way back to his ship at the dock in Yokohama, he learns it is fatal to ask a Japanese gentleman, "Is this the way to Honga-dori?" In any case, the Igorot would answer "Ouen, apo," meaning "Yes, sir"; while the similar reply of the Japanese would be "Sayo, Degozaimasu." The traveler might be headed in exactly the wrong direction, but if he asked whether he were on the right track, he would invariably be told that he was. Subsequent discovery of the error often arouses rage on the part of the misdirected traveller.

As a matter of fact, there is no intention to deceive. The action of the Oriental in any such circumstances is dictated by his desire to "save face". The innate courtesy of the Nippon gentleman would prevent him from saying in his vernacular, "It certainly is not the way to Honga-dori. You are going absolutely in the wrong direction." The implication of such words to the Japanese would mean that he would be causing the traveller to lose face in public by being shown up as so stupid as to lose his way. He could not bring himself to do anything so uncouth. The Igorot warrior, likewise, would not think of contradicting publicly this God-like white man. So the only satisfactory technique when one is lost in the Far East is to stand still, facing obviously nowhere, and then ask, "Where is the road to .....?"

Back of this seemingly insignificant difference in custom between East and West is a fundamental difference in human relations. To the Oriental the most important factor in his psychology is to save face, to save his own face and to prevent his neighbors, friends or anyone he meets from losing face. This bulks just as large to him as does our devotion to the truth.

We must remember that stupid as it is to underestimate enemies, it is infinitely more tragic to misunderstand them. Back in 1923 our lavish generosity to sufferers from the great earthquake and the subsequent fires that wrecked Japanese cities went far to put upon a fine basis our relations with that newcomer into the company of nations. Then, we spoiled it all the next year when in legislation to restrict immigration, we refused to allow the Japanese to be considered under the quota, and instead ruled them out of consideration by excluding all their people as undesirable aliens. By that act we caused Japan to lose face among the nations of the world and they have never forgiven us for it. Future historians who study causes of this present world war will undoubtedly lay an unerring finger of blame upon the government of the United States for the passage of this exclusion act. They will call attention to the fact that if we had admitted Japanese immigrants on the quota basis, the total number entering in any one year would have been less than 200,—certainly not a yellow peril. They might even go so far as to state that if we had admitted this young and proud nation to the status enjoyed by European powers, we not only might have secured from them the cooperation in the operation of our immigration laws, but also would have crystallized into action the good feeling engendered by what we did for relief.

Let me quote from the letter written by the Japanese Ambassador Hanihara to Secretary of State Hughes on April 10, 1924. Note his use of the word "self-respect" as an indication of one aspect of "saving face".

> "To Japan the question is not one of expediency but of principle. To her the mere fact that a few hundreds or thousands of her nationals will or will not be admitted to the dominions of other countries is immaterial, so long as no question of national susceptibilities is involved. The

important question is whether Japan as a nation is or is not entitled to the proper respect and consideration of other nations. In other words, the Japanese Government asks of the United States Government simply that proper consideration ordinarily given by one nation to the self-respect of another, which after all forms the basis of amicable international intercourse throughout the civilized world."

Understanding of this cardinal principle of Oriental human relations must guide our diplomacy and should be clearly understood in the conduct of the war. We cannot expect the Orientals to deal with us at the present time on a basis of truth. They do not understand what we mean by truth, and they cannot be expected to adhere to it whenever that adherence will cause loss of face, or otherwise run counter to their code of ethics. Those of us who have lived for some time in the Far East have recognized the futility of our maintaining diplomatic relations with Tokyo in childlike ignorance of the fact that Japan in action, as represented by the army and navy, accepts no dictation from the constitutional government. It is more than futile, it is unintelligent for us to raise shrill screams of indignation and protest over the attack on Pearl Harbor or the bombing of Manila after it had been declared an open city. In both instances the military and naval authorities of Japan were acting according to their own code and saw no reason why they should be bound by ours when it would be to their undoubted disadvantage. We should remember our inheritance from generations of Indian fighters, who learned that warfare against savages could not be conducted along the precise regulations of medieval chivalry and European diplomacy. Remember Braddock's defeat!

Should we be successful from a military point of view in the worldwide contest in which we are now engaged, there will be laid upon us a heavy responsibility for arranging for some kind of status which may be signified by the word "peace". Permanent peace can be obtained only by permanent understanding on a rational basis. If it is our conviction that human relations stand or fall upon the reliability of the pledged word between man and man, or between nations, we have got to go much farther than mere military victory to get along well with

our Oriental neighbors. We must show them by every possible means the importance of truth.

The most compact single treatise on human relations is to be found in the 5th, 6th and 7th Chapters of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, a passage which we usually refer to as "The Sermon on the Mount". In one short section the Master makes it clear that we must so act and so speak that man can place credence upon our utterance, even upon the monosyllabic "yes" and "no". It should not be necessary, it cannot be necessary that an affirmative must be re-enforced by some mouth-filling oath or that a denial can be supported only by a solemn vow. We must with a gesture throw overboard all the machinery of secret treaties, the entire diplomatic practice of using "weasel words" and we must establish all of our relationships upon the basis of truth, the only basis that will make and keep us free.

At the present time, the danger is that we may in time of war destroy the very Cause for which we think we are fighting. In any form of warfare some deception must enter:—we usually call it camouflage. Even there we still would maintain some adherence to ideals of truth. We are busily engaged in painting the wings of our aeroplanes and would conceal our hangars with brush, but we would spurn the suggestion of dropping parachutists clad in the uniform of our foes. Do we need to clarify such a distinction? While we admit the right of the government to withhold news, good or bad, for fear of giving comfort and consolation to the enemy, we recognize that there must be a limit to this deception; we Americans because of our distinctive national and social inheritance would not tolerate action of the government in making deliberately false statements. We do not want our people to be fed lies, either to arouse indignation or to secure their blind support. We will grant to censorship in time of war the suppression of the sinking of one of our own battleships, but we insist that military and naval intelligence, as well as our national government, does not announce the destruction of a German battleship which may be known to be safely afloat.

In my college days the President of Harvard University, my university, Charles William Eliot, was in American academic circles facile princeps. He was honored not only throughout our

nation but also was held in veneration by all his own students, an achievement indeed. Well do I remember, however, the regrets arising at times, the irritation which we felt because he seemed to have little or no interest in the athletic contests which bulked so large in our college life. We never, for example, saw him present at a baseball game. After his death, however, when his biography appeared, it became clear to us that he never attended baseball games on principle. He could not give support to an athletic contest which seemed to him to be based on deceit. He understood, and of course correctly, that at times the pitcher as he threw the ball would give a twist to it so that it would curve in the air, deliberately deceiving the batter who was trying to hit it. In addition, said pitcher would at times make a gesture as if to throw the ball to one of the bases and then would not throw it. This was deception, and because the Seal of his College bore the word "Veritas", he could not countenance college men using deception in order to get an advantage in a game. He did not live to see the baseball rules changed so that a balk to first would give the runner his base, but he never could have been enthusiastic about that change in a rule because it was not adopted simply as a matter of truth in action. In spite, therefore, of what would seem to some minds trivial and to others entirely unnecessary, we do well to pay our tribute to that fine figure in American education who would not tolerate any deviation from truth.

To college men today comes the need of maintaining high standards of truth in action. As individuals, they must control their spoken vocabulary so that the word will always have proper relation to the fact. They must be careful never to suppress the truth from their own families when misguided attempts to save parents worry tempt to suppression of news of illness, or even college disciplinary action. We are custodians of truth. We should not allow this fact to remain only emblazoned on academic shields, but should make it a matter of living and practice, a principle so far-reaching that men should be willing to die in such a Cause. College students will do well to read again today the Harvard Commemoration Ode, written by a Professor of the University when Harvard men returned to academic peace in 1865.

On another plane is the devotion which all college men must pay to truth as expressed by every progressive conquest of the physical world in which we live. We all have been in touch with men of our age who after weeks or perhaps years of labor, finally succeed in demonstrating one more segment of truth hitherto unknown and now to be added to the sum total of the world's knowledge. For the last two generations foundations, corporations and individuals have vied with each other in giving grants for the encouragement of research. Many a young man is now working long hours with his eyes upon the microscope or the test tube to demonstrate the validity of one more fact, one more law. We can be sure that a nation so devoted for generations to pure research will ultimately be superior to a country in which scientists work in fetters, forever trying unsuccessfully to demonstrate to their people some scientific background for preposterous theories about race, clan or blood, for the reenforcement of theses already agreed upon.

Truth today is in jeopardy. Our young men are being called upon to fight in defense of truth, perhaps to die for it. It is not altogether easy to remove this urge from the emotional field and put it upon a rational basis. We can, however, discuss to our profit what is means to live by the truth.—*This is a reprint of an article which appeared in the Spring Number of the Haverford Review, Haverford College.*

Informal Report of the Executive Committee of the B.A. Degree to the Trustees, at the Faculty-Trustee Dinner, January 9, 1942

CONCERN with the philosophy of education might seem purely academic just now. On the contrary we believe that never perhaps has liberal education been so important.

Trinity College is girding itself to help win the war. We are co-operating in this immediate national task by introducing specialized courses of military usefulness, by holding Commencement early, by making it possible for students to graduate in three years rather than four, and so on. All this is fitting under the circumstances, but it is not enough. We won the last war, but the Germans won the peace. *We* must win this peace. While the warriors and workers must win the war, the problems of peace will demand leaders of a high order, if we are to get any reconstruction that shall prevent another repetition of this catastrophe. We must creatively share in the reconstruction of a society which is to live under the *Pax Americana,* for, as Edwin Murrow said last night: "Make no mistake: the world will be ruled either from Berlin or from Washington." In as much as the salvation of society starts with the education of the individual, the liberal arts college must survive in order to do a better job than it has ever done in the history of education. To do this we must re-examine our education, purge it of its errors, and reshape it so that it can play a far better role in the reconstruction of society.

For many years now the liberal arts colleges have lacked any clear-cut conception of the function and content of liberal education. With the increasing scholarly specialization of their professors, the colleges have atomized their educational offering by departmentalizing their curriculum. They have been an example of modern man's too easy optimism. He has been relying on the technical skills of civilization not only to cure all social and political ills but also to bring the happy fulfilment of each man's human personality.

For college education the net result has been to leave to the immature mind of the student the selection of courses, trusting him somehow to synthesize the conglomeration into a working philosophy of life. The dominant educational policy of our liberal colleges has been in general a lack of policy. Because we were without any guiding philosophy of education, we have dropped the reins on each student's neck, so that he might wander about and graze at will, led only by his immediate and temporary interests. The development of specialized studies has divided liberal education into disjointed and isolated departments of knowledge; but the full man, the really educated man, has become so almost in spite of us, because his common-sense has resisted an artificial and unsound division of the unity of man. The isolation of these little countries of education with their babel of mutually incomprehensible languages has often resulted in fratricidal jealousies. Yet we are all allies pushing back the frontiers of darkness and evil in the life of man.

This lack of policy has been welcomed by certain educators who have little realization of basic human needs and no appreciation of the great human objectives and deeper human values. They have substituted superficial ideas of self-expression, and easy motions of social justice, for real mental growth and spiritual creation. This lack-of-rational-policy as a policy has been welcomed also by the scholarly specialists who find in it freedom for their natural but short-sighted desire to work at their specialized activities without regard for their proper contribution to the education of the student as a whole. The students have liked this policyless policy partly because it permits them to elect pre-vocational subjects while appearing to receive a liberal education, and partly because it frees them from difficult subjects, and thus enables them to avoid the growing-pains of mental development and maturing achievement. As a result our B.A. degrees all too often have little more than prestige or vocational value. Small wonder it is that our students leave college broadly untrained, uninformed, and unintegrated. Small wonder is it, that when called upon to face the world in the present crisis they give evidence of disillusionment and frustration, of individual unhappiness and social irresponsibility.

The conduct of America since the last war, culminating in the sting of such physical blows as those received at Pearl

Harbor and Manila, cannot but hurt to the quick a liberal arts college. We must not evade the admission of our unpreparedness; the American college has not been producing truly educated men of such quality and quantity as to make the forces of good will and good sense alert and persuasively dominant. We have to admit that the liberal arts education is guilty of educational isolation. It has, perhaps, trained men to be capable—prosperous or learned, but at the same time it has not been sufficiently successful in producing fully educated men, mindful of their self-transcending responsibilities, men endowed with a wide range of interests and tastes, men of broad sympathy and appreciation, men fitted to play an intelligent and successful role in the days of reconstruction which lie ahead. To live for oneself is to lose oneself. The liberal arts college should not wait for a Pearl Harbor to produce internal unity; it should train leaders who because of their integrated education can see the relation of the parts to the whole, not only in the individual but also in the national and international society at large.

The lack of harmony and balance in our education is reflected in the parallel breakdown of isolation in a world power which was heedless and careless of its national and international obligations. There is an underlying unity of cause and effect in both these failures. The education which has produced men who are good in their particular profession or business, but not good in the essential task of unifying the personal with the common good, uniting religion and ethics with science and economics, has contributed in a large measure to the failure of world integration.

The bankruptcy of our isolation is but a reflection of the inability of the individual and society to transcend atomic self-interests. We have failed to realize that behind all apparent differences of nationality, governments, creeds, and economic systems there is an underlying unity in all men of all nations who crave the air of freedom and the light of truth. The failure to harmonize politics and economics with the spiritual life is frankly the result of isolation in the mind of modern man. Thus there is an organic relation between the failure of our liberal arts education and the failure to achieve a satisfactory world integration. If we are to win the peace that is to follow the will-to-victory of the present war, the liberal arts education

must show our students that all knowledge is the knowledge of the whole, through its parts; that the species of knowledge must ultimately be grounded in the unity of the spiritual life. The problem of education is still what it was in the time of Plato—the relation of the one and the many in all our experiences and aspirations.

We must produce a liberal arts education which stresses social leadership. This requirement of social leadership implies, and is impossible without, truly educated men. And we realize that the cultivation of truly educated men is, and always has been, the real function of a liberal arts college. We must graduate maturing men with a sound grasp of reality and a firm hold upon the ideals of abiding human values.

We accept the judgment that the liberal arts colleges generally have only partially fulfilled this function these many years past, and we hope that we here at Trinity are on the forefront of a national and an increasing movement to do something about it. There is no question as to the genuine reality of the movement. Ways and means to achieve this end have begun to be prepared by a revision of the curriculum which has as its paramount aim a unifying and constructive program of education rather than a mere miscellaneous assortment of courses.

We are trying to guide this revision by a new focusing of education upon first principles and their practical application for all human and social living. This practical application will be difficult—it is always hard to apply an ideal. But if you, the Trustees, and we, the Faculty, will acknowledge the present necessity of producing men, not merely soldiers or bread-winners or specialists, we can make Trinity a far greater fountain of light and leading.

PROFESSOR ALLEN,
PROFESSOR MEANS,
PROFESSOR NOTOPOULOS.

Gettysburg Via Hartford

A Memorial Paper read by P. J. McCook, *1895 at the February (Centennial) Festival of the Society of the Beta Beta Psi Upsilon Chapter House, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., February 11, 1942.*

AFTER the federal victory of Antietam in the autumn of 1862, the hostile armies had been facing each other across the Rappahannock without much activity, save for the fatal campaigns culminating in Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville. The Union was sunk in gloom over those bloody and humiliating defeats, the South correspondingly elated. The British and French governments, long anxious to see America divided and weakened, were renewing the talk of intervention or at least recognition, discontinued after Antietam. Lee and Davis agreed that a sweeping Southern victory in the heart of northern territory might persuade the Lincoln administration to make peace. Meanwhile a successful invasion would break up the United States railway system, hinder the manufacture of munitions by delaying shipments of coal and iron, cut off northern army supplies, replenish the southern army's provisions, and draw the enemy off southern soil. As Freeman says, "The supreme endeavor of the South to win its independence was now to be made."

So, in the first part of June, 1863, having brought together the greatest Confederate force thus far assembled, its commander, most famous and admired soldier of the day, passed to the west of the Blue Ridge and started north in the Shenandoah Valley. Correctly estimating the situation, Hooker quickly followed on the opposite side of the mountains.

By the last week in June the Confederate vanguard had crossed the Potomac, crossed Maryland, and were well on their way across Pennsylvania, having brushed aside all opposition, reached and scouted the Susquehanna River, and entered the very outskirts of Harrisburg, the capital of the state. Lee,

still to the west of the mountains at Chambersburg, waited awhile for his subordinates to tell him exactly where his foe was and meantime to bring in the produce of the countryside for which they had been foraging. Meade, who had now succeeded Hooker, moved steadily north, protecting Washington and Baltimore and watching to see what the enemy, still reported on the Susquehanna, would do next. Lee naturally preferred not to attack, but select his own ground and make the other man meet him there. Events controlled them both and upset all plans.

East of the mountains, slightly south of east from Chambersburg, about sixty-five miles north of Washington and thirty-five miles southwest of Harrisburg, lay the little town of Gettysburg, the hub of a wheel whose spokes were roads running in every direction, including Chambersburg, Harrisburg and Baltimore. Strong Confederate advance elements, some of which had passed through the very spot on their way to the Susquehanna, were ordered back from the north and northeast by Lee as soon as he heard Meade was approaching. On the northern side of Gettysburg they encountered the cavalry screen of the Union army, pushing up from the south, and one of the world's decisive battles was on. This is early on the morning of July 1, 1863.

When darkness fell, the two Union corps (each about equal in strength to a Confederate division) which had composed the advance, buffeted all day by the furious attack of more than twice their number, had been driven back through the town, and Lee was up with most of his army. Meade's, for reasons already mentioned, was more scattered. Now he understood. All night long the tired Federal columns were hurrying in to reinforce and replace the remnants of the battered First and Eleventh Army Corps. The Confederates, flushed with victory, slept on the field they had won.

Lee, despite Longstreet's expressed views to the contrary, concluded he was committed to the offensive and had to fight where he was. The prestige of himself and his army was at its height. The North was close to panic, the South exultant and sure (though he was not) that Washington and Baltimore were doomed. How could he explain to Richmond retirement

to a better position? How without rashness pass around to a new position behind the enemy's left, when Stuart was not there to secure accurate information? And why sacrifice the gains of the preceding day? Besides, he had more to win as he thought by victory, less to lose by defeat, than Meade. Southern independence must have seemed in sight.

As for Meade, he too considered falling back, for he knew his lines were none too strong or secure. But he also was in a way committed; he also resolved to stand and fight. The issue was joined. The forces of the United States, on their own soil, were battling for national life, facing west and north. For the numerous Pennsylvanians in that army, the situation was indeed one to stir manhood: they stood between Philadelphia their chief city, and their armory Pittsburgh—between the federal and state capitals.

On July 2nd the brilliant engineer General Warren, reconnoitering the lines for Meade, passed along and examined the famous Gettysburg fishhook. He saw the barb of Culp's Hill thrusting east, and the northwest-facing curve of Cemetery Hill. Thus the right of the line remained firmly anchored. He found the shank of the hook, the center and left, less well organized. The left wing was held by Sickles on ground somewhat in advance of the general Union trend, faced by Longstreet on Seminary Ridge in a curved line threatening his flank. Behind Sickles' left units, thus endangered, and separated from each other by a narrow valley, stood out two extraordinary hills, henceforth immortal as Round Top and Little Round Top. Observing a signal flag on the latter, that is, the one to the north, Warren galloped over as the afternoon wore on, and from its summit was able to verify the presence on Longstreet's right, extending beyond the Union left, of a mass of gray-clad infantry ready for the attack. He sent his aides out for reinforcements. One was lucky enough to encounter a mixed brigade bound for another point in Sickles' hard pressed front. Its commander stopped this aide and asked him for his orders. The reply was that a brigade must be sent to occupy Little Round Top at once. The commander replied he would accept the responsibility and take his brigade there. He was a colonel of volunteers. His name was Strong Vincent and his age was twenty-six.

Vincent, son of a prosperous iron man in Erie, settled at Hartford when he was seventeen, prepared at school for Trinty, entered college in the class of 1858, and joined the Beta Beta. After two years he left and went to Harvard, from which he graduated in 1859. The story is that he was expelled from Trinity for making a special trip to Farmington to beat up a janitor who had tattled on a girl he had been visiting at Miss Porter's School. Not conspicuous as a student in either institution, it seems, but recognized as a leader. He was "above the medium height, of a well-formed and powerful frame." His college friend Charles W. Eliot, later president of Harvard, says: "He was one of the manliest and most attractive persons that I have ever met."

He returned to Erie, opened a law office. The war broke out and he enlisted without delay in the 83rd regiment of Pennsylvania infantry volunteers. From the first he was a marked man, and early became instructor of that outfit. The young farmers, clerks and artisans, for whom submission to military authority was a new and distasteful idea, at first thought him an upstart dude. After they saw him under fire a few times and heard that McClellan had pronounced them, as a result of this officer's training, the best drilled regiment in the Army of the Potomac, the picture changed: "The seal of his superiority (I quote from the regimental history) became stamped upon their hearts." Though a strict disciplinarian, he was careful of their lives and health and at all times quiet and considerate. He had commanded the regiment at the battles of Antietam, Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville, and had recently received charge of this brigade, consisting of one regiment each from Pennsylvania, Maine, New York and Michigan.

Instantly grasping the critical situation, he now rode forward with only his standard bearer, leaving his four regiments to follow him at the double quick south through the summer heat for more than a mile. When they arrived at the hill, they found their positions fully selected. He had established his line of defense around the base of Little Round Top in a quarter circle facing Big Round Top and commanding the valley and plain south and west. They were scarcely in place on what has since been known as "Vincent's Spur", under the shelter

of the trees and boulders covering the great rocky mass of which Little Round Top consists, when they heard a loud fierce yell and saw Hood's whole division of Longstreet's corps, at the double, charging in three lines only a quarter of a mile away. For more than an hour the Texans and Alabamans made assault after assault upon the position and on the left penetrated between the two hills, coming repeatedly to within a few yards, but always repulsed with slaughter. The attackers then shifted to the right, where the defenders were not so well sheltered, killed the colonel of a New York regiment which had just come up in support, the captain of a battery on the crest, and the commander of the other reinforcements sent for by Warren. They were breaking through and would, it seemed, roll up the whole Union army from left to right. At that moment Vincent sprang down from the rock where he had been standing, and with the help of his officers and the supporting regiment restored the lines. By the close of the day his brigade, which at the start numbered fewer than 1200, had captured 500 prisoners and 1000 stand of arms, and with the support and reserve had driven the enemy entirely off Little Round Top, out of the gorge and over and off Big Round Top as well.

As a result of this brilliant and gallant action, the federal line now had on its left the equivalent of the anchors on its right. And, despite the severe handling Longstreet had given Sickles, the left of the Union line ultimately came to rest and held firm on those two hills through the remainder of the titanic struggle.

But the price paid was high. A few minutes before the last rush was stopped, Vincent fell with a mortal wound. On July 7th he died at a near-by farm house, a brigadier-general's commission signed by Lincoln in his hand. His young wife (the girl from Farmington) was telegraphed for, but it was too late. Two months afterwards a child was born, but daughter and wife are long since dead.

Gettysburg has been recognized as the high-water mark of the Confederacy, which never recovered from the blow. The battle ended the next day, July 3rd. On July 4th, hopeless of relief, Pemberton surrendered Vicksburg to Grant, Lee ordered

a retreat to Virginia, and Europe decided that for the United States the worst was over.

I shall not read what General Chamberlain, his subordinate, or General Butterfield, his superior, said of Vincent's share in the victory, but merely quote the quaint, blunt soldier-talk of Longstreet:

> "Little Round Top * * * was everything to the success of the Union Battle. General Vincent's prompt action in moving to save that point held it and was the means of getting the battle to his side. Many minutes' delay would have given the Confederates the field."

Lee and Meade are said to have acknowledged that the Round Tops were key positions, but neither enforced his views, apparently. It may be that nobody at first appreciated what these two bits of rocky ground signified. When at last Hood and Vincent raced for their possession, the latter won the race and the fight that followed.

Even you of the active chapter, men of the third generation, must have heard something of the controversy over Pickett's charge on the last day at Gettysburg. Scarcely less important and dramatic, perhaps even more interesting to the student of military science and the reader of history, was this incident on the second day. Without it, indeed, one may question whether there would have been a Pickett's charge. When I was younger, discussion of the Confederate failure to seize Little Round Top in time, and of the consequences, was table talk. I heard it from my father, Professor "Johnny" McCook, who wore the blue. I heard it from my father-in-law, Philip Brown (kinsman of our orator Lawson Purdy), who wore the gray, and on that same sad night of July 2nd lay wounded at the other end of the line on Benner's Hill facing Culp's Hill, with his dying brother in his arms.

The fate of the nation may well have depended upon the outcome of the battle of Gettysburg. That outcome, if Longstreet is right, was in large measure attributable to the training, character, alertness, skill and courage of this young man who, like us, once wore at Trinity College the badge of the Beta Beta.